

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MARCH 7, 2006**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on March 7, 2006 at 6:33 p.m. by Chairman Thompson in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Kosla, Merz, Murphy, Smith, Chrm. Thompson

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Reg Murray, Senior Planner; Steve Geiger, Associate Planner, Sue Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

ITEM III: PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. **Sign Permit – 536 Grass Valley Highway (Rolf Howard – Apex Honda) – File SP – 06-4.** The applicant has appealed the Community Development Director's decision to deny his request for three (3) wall mounted signs to be located at 536 Grass Valley Highway. *This item was continued from the February 21, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.*

Planner Geiger gave the staff report. This item was continued from the February 21, 2006 meeting. Staff has contacted two of the three motorcycle manufacturers and they indicated that the proposed signs are all that are available, but also indicated that there are other signs available based on circumstances. Staff believes the application should be denied. Staff has also provided a motion in the staff report

stating what staff believes the requirements of a new sign proposal should be from this applicant.

Comm. Kosla asked whether the City has documented design guidelines.

Planner Geiger stated that there is no specific guideline for the Highway 49 corridor.

Comm. Kosla asked if an applicant can go on to the City website to obtain information.

Planner Geiger explained that the concerns regarding signage in the area have increased. The code will provide information about the sizes of signs that are permitted. The applicants are encouraged to work with staff to find something appropriate for the site before a sign company is hired to design and build a sign(s).

Comm. Kosla asked when this particular applicant came to the Staff with the sign proposal.

Planner Geiger stated it was in January after the applicant came before the Commission for their Use Permit.

Comm. Kosla asked if this applicant could have applied for the sign permit at the same time as the use permit.

Planner Geiger said yes, they could have, although it may have been difficult for them to have all the details worked out at that time.

Comm. Merz asked if the 2' specification for the signs is so that it will fit within the bands.

Planner Geiger stated that there is 5' between the bands. Staff felt that 2' would be large enough without using the entire area between the bands.

The applicant, Rolf Howard introduced himself. His business at 536 Grass Valley Highway represents three manufacturers. They are trying to compromise between the City and the manufacturers. They are anxious to resolve this so they can get the signs installed on their building. He took pictures of some area businesses' signs, which he gave to Chrm. Thompson to distribute. The proposed signs would give them the name recognition they would like to present to the public. The proposed signs are the smallest available from the manufacturers.

Comm. Kosla asked if the Yamaha sign is the biggest and if it would fit within the bands.

Mr. Howard replied that it is the biggest, and it fits within the bands with space to spare.

Comm. Kosla asked at what point Mr. Howard decided to look into installing the signs and how he determined that the proposed signs would comply with the City requirements.

Mr. Howard responded that it was right after they applied for their Use Permit.

Comm. Kosla asked if they had had a design guideline document to use which showed only a 2 foot maximum height, would they still have applied for these signs.

Mr. Howard stated that these are the signs with the company logos, and they have previously used these signs within the City of Auburn and would like to transfer them to their new location.

Comm. Merz asked if they have other dealerships in the area.

Mr. Howard replied that this is their only dealership.

Comm. Merz asked if they've had to deal with the manufacturers regarding signs before.

Mr. Howard said that usually the dealership is given a brochure of the signs, giving them a choice between one or two signs.

Comm. Smith asked why they are wanting to change from the channeled lettering they had on their other building.

Mr. Howard said that the manufacturers change their logos and signage approximately every 10 years.

Comm. Smith stated that he would like to see something that looks pleasing to the community. Currently there are a lot of mismatched signs along Highway 49.

Mr. Howard agreed and stated that in an effort to compromise, they are proposing putting one sign in the front of the building and one on each side of the building rather than their initial plan to put all three in the front.

Comm. Smith asked about the use of channel lettering as shown in the examples that other motorcycle businesses are using.

Mr. Howard stated that he has no way of knowing if those other dealerships are using their signs legally, or with the manufacturers' approval.

Chrm. Thompson asked about the example of the business that had all of the different companies listed on one sign.

Mr. Howard stated that they have contacted the manufacturers about that type of sign and they will not allow it. The example may show "illegal" signage in the eyes of the manufacturers.

Comm. Kosla asked why they decided to put the Honda sign in the front of the building and the others on the side.

Mr. Howard stated it is for retail and visibility considerations.

Leslie Howard, co-applicant stated that all the signs fit within the 5 foot bands. She also said that they had used the signs on their old building and did not think it would be an issue to move them.

Comm. Kosla asked how long ago those signs were approved by the Community Development Department.

Ms. Howard said the Honda and Yamaha signs were on the building when they purchased the dealership in 2001. They had to file a variance in 2003 to address signage at their previous location. They were also under the impression that since the previous owner of their new building had installed signs on the sides of the building (electrical has been installed) that it was going to be alright to hang their signs there.

Jerry Martin, 948 Herr Way, Auburn, a previous Chairman of the Chamber's Economic Development Committee with many years in commercial real estate, expressed his encouragement to the Commission to keep an open mind about the signage on the Highway 49 corridor.

The public hearing was closed.

There was discussion about the signs.

Comm. Smith **MOVED** to:

- A. Deny the appeal and uphold the Community Development Director's decision to deny the sign permit requested to allow three (3) wall mounted signs to be located on the building at 536 Grass Valley Highway (File #SP 06-4) as shown in Exhibit A, subject to the findings listed below (or as modified by the Planning Commission).

There was discussion about the signs and the desire of the Commission to improve the Highway 49 corridor.

Comm. Murphy **SECONDED**.

Comm. Smith **MOVED** to:

Amend the motion to include:

- B. Require the applicant to submit a revised sign proposal, proposing one of the following: (1) all three signs shall have a three foot cabinet ("can") sign height, shall have letters of the same height not to exceed two feet (with the exception of logos), and shall have a white background color **OR** (2) all three signs shall have individual "channel" letters of the same height not to exceed two feet (with the exception of logos), and shall be mounted directly to the building. Corporate colors may be used for the letters and logos. Final design and placement of signs on the building shall be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Department.

Comm. Murphy **SECONDED**.

AYES: Merz, Murphy, Smith
NOES: Kosla, Chrm. Thompson
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Chrm. Thompson announced that the applicant can file an appeal of the Commission's decision within 10 days.

- B. **Civic Design – 12919 Bill Clark Way (Power Aviation) – File CD 04-6.** The applicant requests approval of a Civic Design for the Power Aviation building proposed at 12919 Bill Clark Way. The request includes the construction of an 8,520 square foot building for aircraft maintenance and repair along with associated parking and landscaping.

Planner Murray gave the staff report. The proposal is for a 7,952 square foot metal frame building on approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ acre on Auburn Airport property. The site is composed of three leased lots. The lease lines need to be cleaned up, which is a part of this project. Staff is in support of the project as proposed.

Comm. Murphy asked some questions of Jerry Beck, the applicant, which he answered.

Mr. Oxley, the owner came to the podium.

Comm. Murphy asked about adding some type of art to the building.

Mr. Oxley replied that he doesn't know what they could put in front of the building.

The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Kosla **MOVED** to:

- A. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Section 15332 (Infill Development Projects).
- B. Approve the Civic Design (File CD 04-6) for the Power Aviation building subject to the conditions listed in Exhibit A.

Chrm. Thompson **SECONDED.**

AYES:	Kosla, Merz, Murphy, Smith, Chrm. Thompson
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

ITEM V: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

- A. None.
- B. Next Planning Commission meeting is March 21, 2006.
- C. As requested by the Commission, the dry erase boards have been installed in the Council Chambers, and the speakers have been installed in the hallway.

ITEM VI: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

None.

ITEM VII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

Comm. Kosla is interested in having some Design Guidelines in place for the City.

Planner Murray stated that this is something that is already on the Planning Commission's interest list. A time can be scheduled for further discussion.

ITEM VIII: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

